

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 10-14 are pending in this application, Claim 2 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, 13, and 14 having been presently amended. Support for amended Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, 13, and 14 can be found, for example, in the original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed.<sup>1</sup> No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the claims were objected to due to informalities; Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph; Claims 2, 3, 5, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 1, 6, 10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Kokado et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0018713; hereinafter “Kokado”); and Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kokado in view of Sekiyama et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0029336; hereinafter “Sekiyama”). Claims 3, 4, and 11 were indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and amended to be in independent form. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter.

In light of this indication, and in order to obtain early issuance of a patent from the present application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, and 14 to include features of allowable Claim 3. In addition, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the objection to the claims and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and paragraph, as discussed below.

---

<sup>1</sup> See previously presented Claim 3.

In response to the objection to the claims, Applicants have amended the claims to correct the informalities noted in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the claims has been overcome.

In regard to the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, page 3 of the outstanding Office Action states that “[t]he features ‘transmitting means for transmitting a schedule for starting to write said contents,’ and ‘a storage means for storing received said contents according to said schedule’ are not fully supported by Applicant’s specification.” However, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 3 clearly shows a storage means and a transmitting means as this figure shows a RAM 83 and a communication unit 86. Further, the above features are described in the specification at least at page 5, line 19 to page 7, line 12, and page 16, line 7 to page 17, line 4.

Further, Applicants note that compliance with the written description requirement of Section 112 only requires that appellant's application contain sufficient disclosure, expressly or inherently, to make it clear to persons skilled in the art that appellant possessed the subject matter claimed. *In re Mott* 539 F.2d 1291, 190 USPQ 536, 541 (CCPA 1976). The test for determining compliance with the written description requirement is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter, rather than the presence or absence of literal support in the specification for the claim language. *In re Kaslow* 707 F.2d 1366, 217 USPQ 1089, 1096 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.


In response to the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 5, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended these claims to correct the informalities noted in the outstanding Office Action. Further, in regard to the phrase “said identified at least one

of said first IDs” at line 15 of Claim 2, Applicants note that this phrase refers to the at least one of said first IDs that is identified by the identifying means, which is described at lines 12-13 of Claim 2.

Accordingly, only claims including allowable subject matter remain pending, and no further issues are believed to be outstanding.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)  
DPB/rac

Derek P. Benke  
Registration No. 56,944

I:\ATTY\DPB\24'S\249031US\249031US-AM2.DOC